

SRR Strategic Planning Session

Adam's Mark Hotel – Denver, Colorado

Wed., July 27, 2005 -- 1 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. **Thurs., July 28, 2005** -- 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

MEETING SCHEDULE:

(These links will jump you to the page with the corresponding notes in this document)

Wednesday, July 27, 2005

1. Discussion to identify focus & content of the updated Strategic Plan and reconnect & review status of SRR in general
2. Review of strategic goals developed at the April 2005 Strategic Planning Session
3. Review of outcomes of the May 2005 Implementation Workshop
4. Updates: University consortium, SRR Charter, Federal Agencies meeting
5. Distillation of Delphi after the Ardmore meeting
6. SRR proposed Schedule need
7. Focused Question: 2010 National Report

Thursday, July 28, 2005

- 1) Review yesterday's work
- 2) Relative priority; Affordability; Do-ability of the Strategic Goals? Timeline? Budget?
- 3) Generate examples of objectives for each strategic goal (*review April Draft*)
- 4) Volunteers to write Strategic Goals/Objectives
 - a. Polish Goal Language
 - b. Draft measurable objectives (written as if we were going to do it – keep realistic and not too lofty)
 - c. Give to Jaime for on-screen display
 - d. Prepare to articulate tactics
- 5) Small group report out & discussion on Strategic Goals & Objectives
- 6) Small groups work together to develop measurable tactics for the objectives
- 7) Small group report out & discussion on Tactics
- 8) Strategic plan – Next Steps

“APPENDIX” MATERIALS:

(These links are provided for you to download the documents from the SRR website)

Handouts:

Agenda for this meeting (*Microsoft Word*)
Definitions from Lou Romero – Strategic Plan & Strategic Goals (*Microsoft Word*)
Notes from Naples, FL strategic meeting (*Microsoft Word*)
Notes from Ardmore, OK workshop (*Microsoft Word*)
October 2003 Strategic Plan (*Microsoft Word*)
Complete summary of Delphi #25 (*Microsoft Word*)
Strategic Plan, Objectives & Tactics – Output from this meeting (*Microsoft Word*)

Presentation:

Summary of Delphi #25 results (*Microsoft Powerpoint*)

Wednesday, July 27, 2005

1. Discussion to identify focus & content of the updated Strategic Plan – Also a time to reconnect & review status of SRR in general – Lou Romero

Reminder to look at the agenda, where the focus questions on the first page will help guide the discussion.

- The old Strategic plan had too many details. The new Strategic Plan should only have a few key objectives. Then, underneath those, we should identify a few key tactics for each of these objectives
- Who is the target audience for the Strategic Plan? 1.) Steering Committee; 2.) Any other participants you try to involve in SRR; and 3.) Potential partners/funders. Audience for the strategic plan needs to be all the stakeholders involved – not just the steering committee because the steering committee members are variable.
- We should maintain both an Internal & External strategic plan. The internal plan should capture all our issues – and there can be disagreement within SRR about that plan. The external plan should be the posture we present to the world – and should be in agreement.
- We will use this meeting to vet any “un-discussable” issues. Strong organizations are able to surface & deal with “the brutal facts.” Participants were invited to share comments on the status of the Strategic Plan and on the progress and any problems with SRR. Any “elephants in the room”, or previously prickly, unmentioned or controversial issues, were called forth to be identified.
- Lou went over some of the key definitions for this meeting ([link to definitions sheet](#))
 - **Strategic Plan:** The purpose of a strategic plan is to articulate the vision, mission, values and the few most vital goals of the organization. It describes where and how the organization will direct its efforts toward its vision. It becomes a principal driver of leadership attention, emphasis, priority and resource allocations. The strategic plan communicated and directs decisions and tactics in ways that create synergy, leverage, interdependence and integration of efforts towards the vision.
 - **Strategic Goal:** One of a select few goals that rise above other operational goals and objectives because of its critical importance in moving the organization towards its stated vision; it is a goal chosen by leaders to address a particular area of concern (GAP) where significant effort must be directed. A strategic goal is usually one of the vital few goals addressed in a strategic plan.
 - **Objectives:** Measure-able statements articulating decisions that commit resources for specific results and will mobilize tactical actions, within a prescribed timeframe, to align with larger, longer-term goals.
 - **Tactics:** Descriptions of how decisions will be implemented and executed to meet stated objectives (How, when, how much, who, etc.)

- By the nature of how SRR is structured, we're a bottom-up organization. Any organization needs leaders (steering committee, etc.) and those leaders need to be able to influence other leaders. Comment made that we really need a re-commitment from people working on the SRR project to get the work done & work hard. We need to have not only a shared vision, but also action. One of the "brutal facts" raised was the differential abilities of people in the room in terms of "being able to play" or carry some decision-making and power weight for the SRR cause.

2. Review of strategic goals developed at the April 2005 Strategic Planning Session

-- *Kristie Maczko*

- We started in the April 2005 meeting with the original Strategic Plan that was finalized in October of 2003. ([link to 2003 Strategic Plan](#)). We morphed these previous topics into the new plan, focusing on creating better, more realistic, and more tangible objectives & tactics.
- We're looking at the feedback from the Delphi #25 ([link to Delphi #25 summary](#)) that was focused on the preliminary new Strategic Plan that came out of the April 2005 meeting.
- We are looking to prioritize and address those concerns raised. We need to pick our areas of focus based on SRR's available assets, funding, staff, etc. We need to determine which strategic areas give the most bang for the buck
- We haven't ever gotten to the "how" & "why" of the C & I. So far, we've just identified those that we feel are important (i.e. the "what")
- We're not the first group to do rangeland monitoring. Are there other organizations we can work with – and at the same time ease our outreach to their base.
- In terms of funding, our main objective is to provide support for the other goals.

3. Review of outcomes of the May 2005 Implementation Workshop

-- *John Mitchell* ([link to May 2005 meeting summary](#))

- The May 2005 Implementation workshop at Ardmore, OK was supposed to be about data and validation of the key indicators. Instead it turned out that people were more interested in knowing where we were going. The group that was there wanted to revitalize & redirect us. They went off in four groups (Agency, University, Marketing, & Funding) and then came back and told us the direction where they thought we should go...
- Take-home messages:
Endorsement of SRR vision and mission
Critical time period (narrower/wider window of opportunity)
Need broader ownership of vision and mission – more inclusive

(e.g. Military & Native Americans – also NGOs, Private Landowners, etc.)
We have many different stakeholder groups, each with different wants & needs...
In order to get going, the stakeholders need to demand it.
Need a concise, consistent message to Congress

- Many levels of coordination are needed
 1. Coordination among and across agencies that deal with rangelands
 2. Coordination across roundtables
 - Not enough money to support all the roundtables
 - Integrate the roundtables?
(problem with stakeholder conflicts & interest)
 - Consider the indicators that work for multiple roundtables as a priority
(recreation, riparian conditions, water quality)?
 3. Within and across the non-federal constituents
Need to get convergence across NGOs
 4. Coordinating indicators at different scales (management-level vs. national-level)
e.g. Differing ways of measuring Rangeland Health – ground level vs. Nat'l level

4. Updates: University consortium, SRR Charter, Federal Agencies meeting

University Consortium update

John Tanaka

- Administrators are asking university folk what they are getting out of SRR
It's either going to fold or get a new mission. We need outside money.
- Western Regional Research Committee structure... These research committees do regional research
- Would W129 committee members (currently mostly economists & sociologists) be interested in supporting the research of SRR?
- This Fall we are coordinating a meeting of the two groups to create a proposal that will be forwarded on through the proper channels. No one has seen any proposals from ARS or Universities that match these objectives
- Federal researchers can work on these committees
- Most of funding for Western Regional comes from CSREES. John Buckhouse – CSREES. The experiment station is required to spend 1/4 of its budget on regional projects
- For the Forest consortium – funding through CSREES. There is a new program director who is a Range person from CSREES

Charter update

Doug Powell

- The Legislative group from the Ardmore meeting developed a cover letter to accompany the charter
- People approached the SRM (Society for Range Management) Board to see if they will sign it. They didn't sign it immediately but said they will sign it pending a one week review from our committees and sections
- Talked about the St. Louis summit and ways to get SRR mentioned at that meeting. We have some SRR people attending. If we put together a one page paper (depending on the agenda) they will try to get SRR mentioned
- Want people hand-carrying the letters to "their people" to be the Champion for each group. We need to let all previous people involved in SRR know that this is coming so they know that their leadership may be coming back to them. Also, we need to let them know that we're going to send it to all your constituency groups, so let us know if there are any problems now.

Federal Agencies meeting update

Paul Geissler & Sherm Karl

- Ted Heinz said in Ardmore that he would host a meeting for the Federal Agencies through CEQ. There have been two meetings thus far. In attendance were CEQ, NRCS, Forest Service, BLM and USGS
- Once agencies realize how much the proposed work will cost they hit a brick wall. Any more pilots? What will we really learn?
- CEQ send a letter out to agency head at Secretary heads. We need to do more homework & specifics because we don't want to get an immediate "no". We need a summary of what we can do. If it's too expensive to do on the ground surveys – still want to do something.
- BLM Monitoring strategy was first outlined by Bud at the Corpus Christi meeting. At that time BLM looked really seriously at the SRR Indicators to chose those that BLM could use for National-level reporting. BLM selected 10 indicators. BLM didn't explain the context well.
- BLM came into first meeting with Kit Mueller (Ardmore). Larry and Janette didn't know who Kit was. Kit & Bud weren't even thinking about the 2010 report with the 10 indicators. They were thinking about this MOU that the FS hasn't signed, talking about consistent monitoring at the household & national levels. Bud's reaction was that FS didn't ante up and just kept throwing up roadblocks (realities). BLM is trying

to re-energize the other agencies. OMB is on their back with their 120 million dollars in monitoring

- No meeting of the minds as of yet. A 3rd meeting is scheduled for mid-August. Question about whether there was a clear purpose stated at the meetings? Or perhaps there were different purposes or scopes at the meeting
- We want to do something – but what is feasible to do? What do we start with? What is wanted is some specific, practical action that we can propose.
- What we expect from the agencies is just some acceptance of the paradigm, definition of sustainability – not yet looking for the action. Until we see from the agency people some policy, it's hard to move forward
- Around the same time there was a Rangeland Health meeting – and discussion there with FS and NRCS & BLM. There was a lot of activity on related issues at same time period – this is a good thing – but it may have contributed to the confusion.
- The University group hoped a commitment to the 2010 report would have come out of the agencies meeting. Wondered why NAST was not invited to the meeting. Topic of contention: Why can't the agencies commit to the report? NGOs have an expectation from the agencies that aren't even being addressed. In turn, we need to define what the agencies expectations are from the NGOs and SRR...
- SRR seems to be having an identity crisis. In 2010 report, there seems to be a great deal of confusion about this document. SRR may not be the playing field to bridge agency documents. So what is the function of SRR? Need everyone to identify what they can realistically do.
- As a topic, we need to go to a roadmap / schedule --> timeframe. We need to delineate who is going to do what? Accountability
- Harsh Reality – Within SRR, we decided that the agencies will do the 2010 report. But the agencies want to work on the data... Is the 2010 report really sold to anyone else other than those people from SRR? Those people within SRR want the data – but do others want it? Is the report the strongest thing we should be using to promote SRR?
- Goal shouldn't be the 2010 report – it should just be the milestone. The goal should be the information that is usable at the national and other levels. Assessment of the sustainability of Rangelands

5. Distillation of Delphi Results -- Jaime Whitlock

[Link to PowerPoint presentation](#)

6. SRR Proposed Schedule Need -- *Bob Breckenridge*

- We need to have a plan of action. All the components of the 2010 report need to be spelled out. Need to take the goals and put a schedule behind each objective: Budget, Timeframe & Responsible people
- Is an Interim “Mock” report needed?
 - With a selected set of indicators and everything run through with those indicators. “Sample bag” – Indicators fleshed out, show real use to different organizations and audiences and scales /levels. It would provide ground-truthing about how difficult this will be. More of a real-time product.
 - We need to look to see where these pieces fit together. We need to get a foundation (MOU) so all the rest doesn’t fall down. The Interim Report could serve as the walls with the 2010 report serving as the roof.
 - Then, the funding issues can trickle out from what you need, which is all listed out.
- We have a few universities with talent you can pull from. Some students at these universities could work on the Interim Report with the Steering Committee providing guidance to the students. There are programs that fund cross-disciplinary research. We should see if we can tap into that. We can use the SRR Framework and Steering group to request that funding.
- 2010 Report shouldn’t be such a huge report. Progress Report was supposed to jump-start the agencies to want to do the 2010 report
- Two tangible things that SRR has done that have helped keep it alive
 1. Progress Report
 2. Conceptual Model
- Alternatives to the MOU = the Charter. Without the MOU signed at high level there will be no traction (very laborious process)... or would an Executive Order be better
- Fundamentally SRR needs to decide if it’s an end user or developer of data. There’s a disconnect – we’re asking people to do things & telling people to do things. We’re wanting to use the stuff at the end and collecting stuff in the middle. Data collection is different from analysis of data, which is what you need to do to assess sustainability
- Preston – chairman of NCBA
He’s the one that has to sell it to Congress if you want to carry this forward and implement it.
- Concern about revision of the Farm Bill – what becomes of Rangelands and Grasslands under CRP (Conservation Reserve Program) as we cut funding for that. Is there a way to move CRP ground to keep it in grassland but save money. Can we move it from CRP to GRP (Grassland Reserve Program) – concern that it’s going to

get plowed again. Looking for pertinence. Looking for speed. Preaching for outcome-based measurement or management. Our indicators are based on functions. Like to see all the help we can get towards making some of the Farm Bill money come towards conservation.

- We need to have relevance to the people on the ground. CSP – reward for people already jumping through the hoops. Should be paid to people based on outcomes. Whether their rangelands are functioning and sustained. Need to maintain some kind of prosperity in those rangelands (economic) – private and public. As long as there is anything that strengthens the prosperity of the owner, that’s what we need. Otherwise, are competing against other values that exceed it. Need to bring value of the rangeland up. Measurement of the social & economic value of it – quantify it. Once you do that, you bring some money to the landowners – the people that manage it.
- How important is it to link economic viability with environmental viability? More understanding of the fact that there is a part of the society that is willing to pay & regulate for environmental values. No one knows how to value “healthy habitat”. We need to be able to measure the progress of improving/declining health of an area.

7. Focused question: 2010 National Report -- *John Mitchell*

- Roots of this roundtable began with the Forest roundtable – but we have no international policy that we need to follow
- Paralleling with Forest Roundtable
1997 – First Approximation Report for Forest
2003 – First Approximation Report for Rangelands
2003 – Forest Roundtable National Report (5 years after Forest 1st approximation report)
2010 (?) – SRR National Report (7 years after Rangelands 1st approximation report)
- Forest Service has one organization responsible for monitoring all Forests.
Rangelands – 2/3 all privately owned, The remainder is managed by many different organizations (BLM, Indian lands, FS)
-- Thus makes it exceptionally difficult to write a report for Rangelands
- 2003 meeting in Jackson, WY --> convince agencies to collect data they could collect, report on those indicators, and slowly push towards improving data collection. If you could start down road towards making data compatible, then monitoring is improved.
- For reporting – each federal agency is responsible for producing reports, therefore each agency has to do monitoring. But if there was a core assessment that led to a core report, then each agency could add to it to satisfy their own reporting requirements. A national report for rangelands, could satisfy part of BLM, RPA, CEQ, Heinz Center. This could lead to a report card for the Nationals Rangelands. If there is an agreement to do this, there will need to be an MOU at some time and/or an act of Congress.

- If you are just collecting data and you have no reason, then it provides a much weaker argument than if you are using it for a reason – a reporting system.
- Main Questions:
Are we assessing the condition & sustainability of the Nations rangelands (regional) to create a reporting system?
Or are we just promoting the use of the data collected through our criteria & indicators?
- We're biting the hand that's feeding us. Pointing out the deficiencies of the agencies' monitoring programs.
- Dick Loper – Try to find out if agencies are going to accept the policy, otherwise we're not going to continue to participate. Need to see some evidence that the powers that be need to say we're committed. It's accepting the paradigm. We understand that paradigm shifts take time – but there's a process. Need to show good faith.
- If we are going to get producer support, need to be able to give these people information they can use. And does this information need to go down to the individual producer? Producers may think that we're measuring a tool for them to use to measure sustainability on their ranch. If you can provide trend information, then can show producer organizations how this will effect on an individual's property. John Peterson – really need to delineate the benefits to the industry
- As a range consultant, family ranches all about sustainability. SRR gives us the ability to measure the destruction of the rangelands – especially custom & culture, social, economic. SRR should be about helping our industry – because if don't help the industry then not sustainable. One of the reasons that individual landowners are struggling, is that land use plan from agencies are not considering the three-legged stool. The 2010 Report needs to have all three components – ecologic, economic & social. People need countervailing data against paving over their land... will provide more macro-scale reasons.
- Can we get better regional/national scale data so when people challenge us, often do that on a regional/national basis. So can address this.
- Until we define what data we're going to use, then we can't worry about data quality. Meta-Data or Data Catalogue. Regardless of the scale of the data. That brings back the question of the interim report. Pick some of the data that are relevant and adequately populated. Standardized data, consistent and coordinated data system – this is new. Meta-Data – need protocols that back up the indicators
- One way data on different scales may be useful – Say the report on sustainability shows one region with increases in bare ground. The scale that we're reporting on is a regional scale. That is helpful to the individual landowner, who can check whether on

their property that issue is a problem. And may tell the landowner the reason for bare ground. It may show the economic & social impact of this issue to the individuals.

- Benefits of the Roundtable, BLM can't geographically allocate money. Usually just by state vs. the ecologic, economic, social conditions – so budgets allocated regionally, then money will trickle down to individual landowner.
- Historical background: When it started out, SRR decided that it would put together mock report on sustainability to jump-start getting continuous reporting. Then we decided that that's beyond the capabilities of SRR. We put the National Report deadline in the future (2010), because if the agencies were going to be responsible for doing the report, then they would need an unprecedented level of coordination between the agencies. Now, SRR needs to do a report to jump-start the National Report... Have come Full Circle. And what is the Progress Report that we did in relation to all this? Did it all volunteer. The progress report is not a sustainability report. Still think the agencies need to do the National Report – but always preached that it needs to be used for agencies in their budget allocation process.
- What is the report going to look like? What is the content? What is the outline of the chapters? Who wants a 2010 report? Or does just the information need to be available for others to use in their reports? What is the 2010 report buying the agencies? Can other agencies – with their favorite dataset with a legacy – be brought together (US Fish and Wildlife, etc.)
- We can't see the what would do with a report until we define what data we want and how we would use the data – and how that in combination will help construct the product that will be able to assess the sustainability of rangelands. Product - close to C & I – gets you towards the ability to assess the sustainability.
- What data do you need? What data exists? What do you want? What can we afford? What is realistic?
- If down at site level, solving issues. Dealing with getting NEPA done, Responding to law suits, Land Management planning. We don't have the budget to do that job right.
- Given that scenario, and given the range budget, jump up national/regional scale and address questions of rangeland health. What's happening that isn't at site. Don't do larger-scale if we can aggregate from the bottom-up. Two jobs – one at site level (not currently funded adequately) and then at regional level (where is this money coming from?)
- If go back to what data you want & what is the product you're trying to put together to address sustainability, then if it's too big then it's not doable. If laundry-list is too long, then it will be too big and will die of its own weight.

- Looking out 100 years, looking to report every 10 years to get a measure of sustainability. ID those data sources that are more data-rich than others, put into a “mock” report in order to provide a basis to get a grip on what these longer-term reports will look like. Over time, as we agree that these are the key indicators, just the momentum may cause changes over time. We argued for only one indicator that could be looked at now. This is what we can do with what we have.
- If we aren’t going to do the report, what are we going to do? Who wants it? TNC, Congress, EPA, Heinz Center, CEQ, Key National Indicators Initiative --> but not necessarily the funders. SRR about promoting all these issues (cheerleaders).
- We don’t want to cripple our ability to manage rangelands in order to get the higher-level information on long-term. Is this trade-off a real problem? You monitor at the allotment level because that’s where decisions are made. This brings back to the Congress issue – concerned about them telling us that “we want you to do this National level reporting – but do this within the confines of your existing budget”.
- There is a great deal of rangeland worldwide, and we’re the only country trying to look at sustainability, and it’s being watched worldwide
- There are successful models for champions for particular indicators that have an investment in having those done.
- Local stakeholders need to help sell it... going to the agencies and recalibrating their budgets. The agencies aren’t going to do it because SRR said so. Haven’t answered the question with what will resonate to get them to help us.
- Doug & Dick – same, would like to be able to answer questions at the national scale. The report shouldn’t be at the top of the list. #2 –Data --> we still don’t know what we’re asking for. Premature to be talking about the report when don’t know what... Do #2 first, so everyone has an idea about what will be in the final product. Data catalogue – cost effective?
- At Ardmore, heard from participants that window of opportunity is small. Didn’t hear a problem with the National Report. Need to resolve National Report issue because the charter refers to it. When think of National Report – need to be involving other agencies to give social and economic information.
- Concept of sustainability – is everyone in agreement on the concept? Otherwise the inter-agency report will never work. Need progress on this acceptance of this paradigm.
- Let’s be parsimonious on the report, start simple
- Start tomorrow with re-wording Strategic Goals & re-prioritization. Objectives & Tactics added tomorrow.

Adjourn – 6:08 pm

Thursday, July 28, 2005

1. Review yesterday's work

- Who primary /target audience for the strategic goals, objectives & tactics?
 - Should be all leaders and stakeholders
 - Not just steering committee
 - Other groups, supporters, partners in the SRR vision
 - Perhaps just an executive summary to those not in the inner SRR group (have internal & external versions with different degrees of consensus & detail)
- Talked about Ardmore & outcomes
- The final goal of financial needs – not clear whether this should be a strategic goal
- Agreed that Promoting Data Quality is not a Strategic Goal --> something more like an objective. Instead substitute the Promotion of Assessment of Rangelands Sustainability
- Current SRR Goals:
 1. Promotion of Rangelands Sustainability Paradigms
 2. Promotion of Assessment of Rangelands Sustainability
 3. Research
 4. Coordination
 - (5. Financial needs ??)
- Need more descriptive language in Goals 3 & 4.
- When we think beyond the US, Global, where does that fit in? Whatever we do here, will become one of a couple formats for global rangelands assessment. We may be leading the pack for this.
- Do we have a good feel for whether we are going to DO the assessment or just being a cheerleader & coordinator /facilitator for other people to do it? Don't think we're still on the same page with this. We might not be far enough along to decide that. Once we start putting objectives/tactics to these strategic goals may be able to get a better feel for this.
- When worked on the Academy Report, we could walk away and say we wrote the report and nothing happened. But now it's coming back. So back to the timeframe. Are we too impatient? Need to determine the timeframe to determine the correct rate that we need to be moving at. In Naples, we said the Strategic Plan was a 3 – 5 year plan

Continue review of yesterday:

- Bob Breckenridge present an SRR Timeline to see what needs to happen at what time
- Then spent 2 hours on National Report. Went over “Mock report” option.

- Remembered that a year ago there was an outline made of the National 2010 Report – that we forgot about yesterday. We can talk about that later today. Talked about it in St. Paul – but then tabled it. It was supposed to be used just as an example to take to the agencies to say, This is what it *could* look like. Without the blueprint, everyone might be thinking about different things – so everyone gets caught up in talking about it...
- Commit this morning to making an identifiable progress on an issue. Could be 2010 report. Need to have an identifiable product – everyone deserves it. Otherwise will not be successful. Need to resolve 2010 report especially considering that the Charter refers to it.

2. Relative priority; Affordability; Do-ability (implementation) of the Strategic Goals? Timeline? Budget?

- The order of the Strategic Goals seen as good. Seems like they all build on each other & fit together as a nice package.
- Dick – the membership of this group should not be driven by the federal agencies. Should be the private sector. Going to the budget piece with that in mind, Larry Bryant thinks someone in the Executive Department needs to see need for this and make it a priority. The private sector will then need to be behind that effort, pushing for it, to drive the Executive Dept. to push the agencies. If the private sector doesn't want this to happen, in the long term, it won't happen.
- Private sector is still on the sidelines. Still waiting and urgently requesting that we move forward with identifiable products. The card is Rangeland Health. Want to make sure the same problem had in the past doesn't happen again. We've accepted the paradigm, now we need the products. We were concerned that Range Health went to regulation instantly once NRC Report got published – even though we didn't necessarily know how to do it.
- That's an honest threat, because once an agency puts forth the effort to do the report, they need a regulatory underpinning Dick & Doug had good verbiage yesterday for talking to the people on the ground.
- Trying to figure out the funding & organization to get this working. Two options:
 1. Go to Federal Agencies and ask for money
 2. When work on NRC Report, go to a scientific organization that is willing to work on the contract to bring together all the parties (Federal Agencies and other parties) to do the job. The NRC has been told the only way they will survive is on a contracting basis. If the Fed Agencies do not move forward, then we still have one option with credibility – we work with agencies to fund this through the NRC. This seems like only other credible route.

- Are the roundtables the appropriate venue & mechanism to make this happen? EMAP, CNER, Heinz Center. What has the roundtable accomplished? Good reports, but moving towards assessment - not so much. Because we have so many stakeholders at the table, sometimes means we can't move as fast. We need some interim & long-term goals to show that we're relevant.
- Forest Service involved in a lot of processes & in reporting, multiple responsibilities. No one look at them in total. High-level committee to look at how FS works to meet laws/demands of American Public. They wrote a letter supporting the work of the Roundtable.
- Dennis – gave a series of seminars on SRR & Sustainability in China (300-400 people) One of the important things we've done is the model (human/ecological side). Brought it all together to talk about sustainability. What we've done is very significant. Brings a lot of hope and enthusiasm to other people working on these issues. Promised a session on sustainability in China 2008. Their message that they really want, it's more than just ecology... it's the people. With "rangeland health", it usually leaves out the people. That's the main thing we contribute.
- The NGOs and others need people of equivalent measure from the agencies here. It's only fair to them. Need a consistent message from even within the agencies.
- The question was about funding – the roundtables were not designed to last as a vehicle. So now that we've created the indicators, now what? The major players aren't all here. Need to find an alternative funding source beyond the agencies. SRR Roundtable is now into the organization-building phase.
- The agencies that are here are more focused on the ecologic side. Will the agencies help fund the Social & Economic indicators? Can & will agencies work with the S & E outside organizations?
- If SRR folded right now, would there be a rush of concern/support from agencies, private landowners, NGOs saying that "Hey, you're not done yet?" There wouldn't be a sign of relief – it would be a neither a positive or negative because it's not really on the leadership's radar.
- SRR is keeping an issue up-front & the issue is being talked about outside of the agencies. If SRR closed down, then who would be talking about it? If SRR goes away, then the issue goes away until someone else picks up the issue. Done the C & I, now just not sure where to go. Agencies' job is to fuel and support the effort to see where it goes. If not for SRR, the agencies working together (Ted Heinz & CEQ) wouldn't have happened.
- Rooter Brite –Roundtable is an objective organization that can bring scientific data that can be decimated – so Congress will fund it to the level where can be available for

future organizations. If SRR goes away, then no other big organizations have this on their plates

- Doug Powell – Overall benefits of what we've done so far, only a few would be realized. People don't know what kind of benefits would have come from this and don't understand the knowledge that could have come from it. This group is the only one that can try to promote the concept of sustainability. There would be a loss.
- EMAP-- It's not a 9-11 issue. So difficult issue to bring along. But we're looking at important issue. It's a cancer that's growing... it will be crisis some day. Dealt with this 10 years ago and couldn't do it and we've lost millions of acres since then. If we close shop again, it'll come back again 10 years from now and we'll be that much more behind. We can try to deal with these things. If we don't, we're ignoring the issue. Need to put the train wreck in front of people.
- Frustrations shown in Ardmore & here, we don't want it to go away. We want to be a part of it. Put it in terms we can understand and sell. Looking at previous organizations that have been involved is impressive. We'd just like you to come up with something.
- We're about sustainability – definition not agreed upon. That's where we're different. The four roundtables are unique in that sense. Also we're involved in building a toolkit – where we need to be seen as relatively impartial to be able to use the tools. This makes us a little conflicted as well.
- Universities perspective – very interested and willing, but looking for the returns the universities need to stay involved. Just need some action items.
- Why isn't the leadership here? Gary & Kristie put together a NRCS support proposal. State conservationists / Asst. Chief of NRCS – standardized resource assessment, coordinated monitoring efforts and the socio-economic side.
- We have a responsibility beyond the C & I (our baby)... don't abandon the baby. Continue to guide and support the successful development of the baby.
- St. Louis meeting – Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative. Perfect opportunity to be involved. Invited once again. How best to participate? We endorse SRR, Charter signings... John Peterson is in charge of this upcoming meeting

3. Generate examples of objectives for each strategic goal (review April Draft)

The following are the four Strategic Goals:

1. Promotion of Rangelands Sustainability Paradigms
John Peterson, Dick Loper, Kristie Maczko, Bill Fox
2. Promotion of Assessment of Rangelands Sustainability

Gary Evans, Bob Breckenridge, Dick Lindenmuth, Sherm Karl

3. Research

John Mitchell, Doug Powell, John Tanaka

4. Coordination

Paul Geissler, James Bernard, Dennis Child, Bud Cribley

4. Volunteers to write Strategic Goals/Objectives

- Polish Goal Language
- Draft measurable objectives (written as if we were going to do it – keep realistic and not too lofty)
- Give to Jaime for on-screen display
- Prepare to articulate tactics

LUNCH BREAK

5. Small Group report-out and discussion on Strategic Goals/Objectives

[See Strategic Plan link & in appendix](#)

The following represents feedback from groups on the Strategic Plan Objectives:

Goal # 1:

- If SRR got FACA status it would let SRR be a formal advisor. Should this be expanded beyond SRR – should we instead just say that there should be “one” made? Be careful about control issues with this
- Take date off the National Report to just have it happen when it’s feasible, if it’s feasible
- Concern about guarantees that SRR is a US program – may have some sensitivities about bringing in International focus
- Wordage within the objectives still needs some work

Goal # 2

- Promote vs. Provide in the Goal title. “Provide” implies that SRR is doing this... is this correct?
- Tracking institutional arrangements – SRR should keep a record on all decisions made, which protocols various organizations use, at higher level? Not so much as a record keeper – as being knowledgeable about what’s important in our field
- For FGDC (Federal Geographic Data Committee)– Does it have a socio-economic section? Yes. Recognize that there are standards that need to be followed & we need the functionality of common data communication between people & between topics.

Goal # 3

- Should SRM be called out specifically?

Goal # 4

- Combination of coordination and outreach from the old Strategic Plan
- Importance of “inreach” – need to get information to people that have been involved in the past. Relates to communication plan, communication materials, etc.
- How does SRR fit in with the other efforts going on out there? Need to figure that out internally and then communicate that to others. Need to figure out our USP – unique selling proposition. We want to make sure everyone knows what our role is.

Discussion about the role of SRR

- From the Portland meeting, we said that we wouldn't be working with the data – instead we supply the foundation for an unbiased estimate... and to act as cheerleaders for the sustainability paradigm. Still some confusion on what the role of SRR is.
- Forest Roundtable has had same problem because for them it's a Federal Report they are creating. Perhaps have the agencies produce the report and others review the report.

6. Small groups work together to develop measurable tactics for objectives

7. Small Group report-out and discussion on tactics

[See Strategic Plan link & in appendix](#)

The following represents feedback from groups on the Strategic Plan Objectives:

Goal #1

- Dick and John will suggest some products that SRR could create to producer groups & get feedback. Do this for universities too?
- If get this high-level agency meeting, the content would need to be rehearsed and exceptionally well done. Maybe have a focused (10 agencies maximum) meeting and also alternative meetings to bring agencies not currently on board into the loop. Who invites & who invited to these meetings?
- GLCI National Grassland Conference – Plenary session for SRR. Workshops – can be designed to be whatever we need.

Goal #2

- Progress Report update – should be ready very soon. It is still missing 2 chapters.

- The 2010 report – a report on the indicators or analysis of the indicators & a final product. One shot to do this right & get report out to be used in the way we thought they should be used. Compared to Rangeland Health report – regulations started right away. Concerned. The Rangeland Health report was the analysis – the 2010 report is different. 2010 report is more data-rich and shouldn't really have information that's disputable – less analysis.
- Get a dry run at progress report at October SRR meeting. Then get in front of the agency heads at their meeting. Thought that 2010 was not a rigorous analysis. Need to be very careful about what outcome comes from it. If the report is misconstrued, you can lose support very quickly from the producers. 2010 report should just be what the agencies have settled on.
- Heinz report & EPA's model – lots of "work in progress"/ caveats
- Is the progress report robust enough to make the case for SRR if going to Agency Heads is the make or break point?
- Rather than getting the agencies together – should be working at the department level – getting OMB & CEQ & someone from the White House. Assistant Secretaries & Mark Rey. The agencies are busy with their own business – the decision to make it happen needs to come from above them to negotiate. CEQ is a driver here. OMB is telling us to do this. The agencies aren't really responding. Interest is at a higher level. White House involvement creates a lot of leverage.
- GAO papers out for indicators/sustainability.
- Thought not to muddle up the agency head level with details. It's a pretty basic message to try to sell sustainability. Do we need more than this?

Goal #3

- Need to try to get conceptual model in there... should it be part of the second goal? IGERT program as a potential way to address some of these issues? www.igert.org

Goal #4

- Need to do a catalogue of current SRR materials – make these available online or at least list them there
- For the funding issue – we don't want to be presenting this to everyone when we are pitching our strategic plan. But we internally want to make sure it's just as important as the other strategic goals.

8. Strategic plan – Next Steps

Task	Responsibility
------	----------------

1. Send out rough draft to this group	Jaime Whitlock
2. Consistent wording; Format; Grammar; Acronyms; Consistent order of common phrases; Compare to old Strategic Plan	Dennis Child & John Mitchell
3. Distribution? To who?	Dennis Child & Kristie Maczko
4. Look at how we structure how to implement (start up/re-start sub-groups and assign out responsibilities). Also types and frequency of meetings (internet meetings?)	Doug Powell, John Mitchell & Dennis Child
5. Adopt – Start implementation of tactics	Steering Committee
6. Timeline Matrix compiled	Dennis Child
7. Operational plans flowing from Strategic Plan (Steering Committee and Co-conveners)	Doug Powell, John Mitchell & Dennis Child

Adjourn! Thanks everyone!!

APPENDIX LIST

Handouts:

- Agenda for this meeting (Microsoft Word)
- Definitions from Lou Romero – Strategic Plan & Strategic Goals (Microsoft Word)
- Notes from Naples, FL strategic meeting (Microsoft Word)
- Notes from Ardmore, OK workshop (Microsoft Word)
- October 2003 Strategic Plan (Microsoft Word)
- Complete summary of Delphi #25 (Microsoft Word)

Presentations:

- Summary of Delphi #25 results (Microsoft Powerpoint)

Attendance List:

Name	Affiliation
Dennis Child	
John Mitchell	
Kristie Maczko	
Jaime Whitlock	
Lou Romero	
John Tanaka	
Bob Breckenridge	
Bill Fox	
John Peterson	
Bob Drake	
Dennis Thompson	
Doug Powell	
Bud Cribley	
Paul Geissler	
Gary Evans	
Dick Loper	
James Bernard	
Dick Lindenmuth	
J.O. Ratliff	
Rooter Brite	